

THE REFORMER.

Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that executeth judgment, that seeketh the truth.—*Jeremiah, v. 1.*

VOL. XI.]

PHILADELPHIA, JULY, 1830.

[No. 127]

SOCIETY FOR ENFORCING A SABBATH.

At the late annual meeting of the society denominated "*The General Union for Promoting the Observance of the Christian Sabbath,*" held in New York, the "Reverend" Mr. Rice, of Virginia, moved the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we earnestly recommend the formation of auxiliaries throughout the United States; the diffusion of appeals in behalf of the Sabbath; the collection of funds for the employment of agents; the union of Christians of every denomination in this common cause; the active and persevering labors of the friends of the Sabbath, in promoting its observance in every part of the country."

The editor of the National Gazette, in speaking of this resolution, observes:

"The collection of funds for the employment of agents." Here is the true expedient. When funds are collected, agents enough will be forth-coming. Dryden thus describes one of the successful saints of his day: 'He has the turn of an eye—a demure smile, and a godly cant, which are worth millions to him.'

STOPPING THE MAIL ON SUNDAY.

The following proceedings in the House of Representatives at Washington, have appeared only in a few papers, and we therefore present it to our readers.

House of Representatives, Mar. 8, 1830.

Mr. Strong presented a petition for stopping the Mail on Sunday, and moved that it be printed. Mr. Johnson, of Kentucky, opposed the printing, as no petition against stopping the Mail had been printed, and the petitioners on that side were at least *four times as numerous* as those in favor of stopping the Mail, and quite as respectable. He thought it probable the

House would not be able to act on the subject the present session, and was sorry there was no chance of ascertaining who were in favor, and who opposed to the measure. It seemed the time had not yet come when it was to be deemed sinful to receive a paper, or read a letter on Sunday, and every man denounced who did not acquiesce in this opinion. He deprecated the agitation of religious questions in the House; and was desirous of knowing who were in favor of legislating on religion or encouraging the exercise of such dangerous and unconstitutional power. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the vote was, for printing the petition 47, against it 119.

The forty-seven were of course friendly to "Dr." Ely's "Christian party in politics," so that it may now be safely inferred that such a party exists both in the Senate and House of Representatives.

THE OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY.

[As the observance of Sunday as a Sabbath, is now under examination in this country, and there are those who would wish it to be enforced by legal penalties, and make use of it as an instrument to carry their measures into effect, and acquire an ascendancy in the councils of the nation, we shall continue our extracts from the pamphlet alluded to in our preceding numbers.]

"Dr. Paley says, 'A cessation from labour on Sunday, beyond the time of attendance upon public worship, is not intimated in any passage of the New Testament; nor did Christ or his apostles deliver, that we know of, any command to their disciples for a *discontinuance upon that day of the common offices of their professions.*'"

Again, he says, "The opinion that Christ and his apostles meant to retain the duties of the Jewish Sabbath, shift-

ing only the day from the seventh to the first, seems to prevail *without sufficient proof*; nor does any evidence remain in Scripture that the first day of the week was thus distinguished in commemoration of our Lord's resurrection."

The author is happy to have so learned and respectable a divine as Michaelis of his opinion. He says, chap. xv. s. 3, "The Epistle to the Colossians resembles that to the Ephesians, both in its contents and in its language, so that the one illustrates the other. In all three, the Apostle shows the superiority of Christ to the Angels, and warns the Christians against the worship of Angels. He *censures the observance of Sabbaths*, rebukes those who forbid marriage, and the touching of certain things, who deliver commandments of men concerning meats, and prohibit them."

From the following verse in the 2nd chapter of Genesis, "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all the work which God created and made"—many persons have maintained that the Sabbath was instituted at the Creation, and therefore that it is binding on all mankind, and not confined to the Jews. This would seem a fair inference, if the contrary were not expressly declared; and therefore the book of Genesis must be considered to have been written (by Moses writing the account 2500 years after the event) proleptically. And it is a very strong circumstance in favour of this, that it cannot be shown from the sacred books, that any one of the patriarchs before the flood, or after it, ever kept a Sabbath, or that it ever was kept, until ordered by Moses on the journey of the Israelites from Egypt to Sinai. If the first patriarchs had kept it, in the history of more than 2500 years (from Adam to Moses) it must have been noticed or alluded to. The lives and domestic transactions of Noah and his family, of Abraham, Isaat, Jacob, and Joseph, are very

particularly described; but not a single word is ever said of their keeping a Sabbath, or censure on them for neglecting it, or permission for them in Egypt, or elsewhere, to dispense with it. On the meaning of the above passage of Genesis, the Rev. Dr. Paley says: "Although the blessing and sanctification, i. e. the religious distinction and appropriation of that day, was not made till many ages afterwards, the words do not assert that God *then* 'blessed' and 'sanctified' the seventh day; but that he blessed and sanctified it *for that reason*: and if any ask, why the Sabbath, or sanctification of the seventh day, was then mentioned, if it was not *then* appointed, the answer is at hand; the order of connexion and not of time, introduced the mention of the Sabbath, in the history of the subject which it was ordained to commemorate."

When the author of Genesis was giving an account of the orders of God to Adam to erect a tabernacle, or place of worship, to the east of Eden; to Cain and Abel to offer sacrifice; to Noah also to sacrifice when coming out of the Ark, and to the latter to abstain from eating blood, &c.; and when he was describing the institution of circumcision, and the paying of tithes by Abraham, he would certainly have said something respecting the Sabbath if it had been then instituted. The reason why the Sabbath was not named as being kept by the Patriarchs was, because it was *not* kept by them; they knew nothing about it.

Archbishop Magee says, note 67, on the Doc. of At.: "But in what way is the divine appointment of the Sabbath recorded? Is it anywhere asserted by Moses, that God had ordered Adam and his posterity to dedicate every seventh day to holy uses, and to the worship of his name; or that they ever did so, in observance of any such command? No such thing. It is merely said, that having rested from the work of creation, God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it."

Mr. Beausobre, in his Introduction to the New Testament, expressly allows, and gives his reasons for believing, that the Sabbath was *not instituted* till the time of Moses. He admits also, that when it was instituted, it was a *feast*, not a fast; and he points out the circumstance of Jesus going to a *feast on that day*, Luke xiv. 1. He asserts that it was given as a sign of the covenant, and was limited to one people, the Jews. He shows that the conduct of Jesus on the Sabbath places it on the same footing as the other Jewish ceremonies. He allows, that in Genesis the sanctifying the Sabbath day was spoken by way of anticipation. He says, feastings and rejoicings were also thought essential to the Sabbath, according to Philo, Josephus, and the Thalmudists,—Beaus. Int. Part. i. p. 193, &c.* He further says, “The account of the creation was not given till after the coming of the children of Israel out of Egypt, with a design to turn them from idolatry and the worshipping of creatures. Moses takes from thence an occasion of giving them to understand, that this is the reason why God hath sanctified the seventh day, and appointed this festival, to be by them celebrated every week. Upon this supposition, the sanctifying of the Sabbath does not relate to the creation of the world, where we find it mentioned, but to after ages.”—Ibid.

If the expression in the second chapter of Genesis had been understood by Moses or any of the Prophets to be applicable to all mankind, when they were reproaching the Gentiles for their sins in innumerable instances, and enumerating their offences seriatim, (to warn the Israelites against them) they would some time or other have reproached them for their neglect of the Sabbath. The Bible is almost filled with the reproachings of the Israelites for their imitations of the vices of the Gentiles, and for their neglect of the

Sabbath; but in no one instance is it ever hinted, that the neglect of the Sabbath was one of these examples of imitation. It also is quite incredible, that the *Gentiles* should not have been even once reproached, for the neglect of this very important rite, if it had been considered applicable to them; and if it were not applicable to them, it evidently cannot be applicable to us.

We will now proceed to examine the passages in the Old Testament relating to this subject.

In the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, the Sabbath is first instituted; as it is said in the fourth verse, in order that the Lord might know whether the Israelites would walk in his way or not. And in the fifth verse it is said that twice as much manna was sent on the sixth day as on other days. In the twenty-second and twenty-third verses the rulers come to Moses for an explanation of the reason of the double quantity coming on the sixth day; and then Moses explains to them that the seventh day is to be a Sabbath, or day of rest; but he there gives them no reason why the seventh day was fixed on, rather than the sixth or any other day; and in this chapter it is merely stated to be ordered to try them if they would walk in the way of the Lord or not. Verse 22d, “And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses.” 23d, “And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you, to be kept until the morning.” 24th, “And they laid it up till the morning.” 25th, “And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it in the field.” 26th, “Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it

* This book is peculiarly used as a lecture book by the University of Cambridge.

there shall be none." 27th, "And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none." 28th, "And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?" 29th, "See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days: abide ye every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." 30th, "So the people rested on the seventh day."

In several places of the quotation above, a mistranslation has taken place; the definite or emphatic article has been used instead of the indefinite one. Thus, in the twenty-third verse it is said, *the rest of the* holy Sabbath, instead of *a rest of a* holy Sabbath.—Again, in the twenty-sixth verse it ought to have been said on the seventh day, which is *a Sabbath*, in it, &c. not *the Sabbath*, &c.

In the twenty-ninth verse, the emphatic or definite article is correctly used, *the Sabbath*, according to the Hebrew text, the Sabbath being there spoken of as instituted. The author has been the more particular in the examination of these texts, because he has met with several clergymen, not learned in the Hebrew language, who have maintained, that from the use of the emphatic articles in the places in question, a previous establishment, and an existence of the Sabbath must be necessarily inferred. But the fact is, that the contrary inference must be drawn from the Hebrew text: and no Hebrew scholar will doubt a moment on the correctness of what is said respecting the Hebrew definite article. It is not one of the points of this language about which there has been any dispute.

If this related merely to the common affairs of life, no one would doubt that the coming of the rulers of the congregation to Moses showed clearly that they were *ignorant of the Sabbath*—that they had never heard of such a

thing before: for if they had known that it was unlawful to provide food, or gather sticks to light a fire to cook it, or to do any other act of work or labor, how could they have had any doubt what the double quantity was sent for on the day before the Sabbath? And the answer given by Moses in the next verse, "this is what the Lord hath said," implies that the information given to them was new. If the practice of keeping the Sabbath had prevailed with the Israelites when in Egypt in their bondage, (a thing very unlikely) or if it had been known to them that it was their duty to keep it when in their power, the Bible would simply have told us, that they gathered twice as much on the sixth day, because the next was the Sabbath: there would have been no coming together of the elders, or of speech-making by Moses. Besides, the text says, that it was ordered here to try them, whether they would walk in the way of Jehovah at this particular time or not. This is directly contrary to the idea of its being an established ordinance from the creation. It was here given as a test of their obedience—it was continued afterwards, as a sign of the covenant entered into betwixt God and them. Nor is there any where an intimation, that the appointment of the Sabbath was the *renewal of an ancient institution*, which had been neglected, forgotten, or suspended.

In the decalogue which is ordained in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, the Sabbath is first given in all its plenitude; but it is, with the remainder of the decalogue, expressly limited to the children of Israel. God begins with saying, "I am the Lord *thy* God, which have brought *thee* out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Here he calls the Israelites *thee*; and he goes on throughout the whole addressing them in the second person singular, "*Thou* shalt have no other gods but *me*," &c. If the language is to bear its common and usual signification, the law as here given is limit-

ed to the Israelites. In the twentieth chapter of Exodus, at the tenth verse, the emphatic or definite article has been substituted for the indefinite one, the same as has been done in the sixteenth chapter, as was before shown.

In this place, where it means to describe that the seventh day is to be a day of rest, it says, *A Sabbath*; but where it has reference to what had past before, viz. to its previous institution, it says, **THE Sabbath**.

Again, the Sabbath is *ordained* in the thirty-first chapter of Exodus and fourteenth verse; and it is here again expressly *limited to the children of Israel*, and declared to be for a sign of the covenant. God says, it is holy *unto you*, not unto all the world.— Again, he says, “Wherefore the children of Israel (not all mankind) shall keep, &c., for a perpetual covenant, &c. It is a *sign* betwixt *me* and the *children of Israel*.”

How can more clear words of limitation be used? And, as Dr. Paley says, “It does not seem easy to understand how the Sabbath could be a *sign* between God and the people of Israel, unless the observance of it was peculiar to that people, and designed to be so.” In the fourteenth verse God does not say that it is *holy*, but it is *holy unto you*. A clear limitation to the children of Israel.

Now, after reading these passages, can any one deny, that the Decalogue was given as a sign of the covenant betwixt God and the Israelites? And it seems to follow, that when the covenant was fulfilled, the sign was abolished.

On the reason assigned in Exodus for the institution of the Sabbath, Dr. Paley observes: “It may be remarked, that although in Exodus the commandment is founded upon God’s rest from the creation, in Deuteronomy the commandment is repeated with reference to a different event.”

In the following places the order to *keep the Sabbath* is repeated; but in

every one it is limited to the Israelites: Exod. xxxv. 2, 3. Levit. xxiii, 3, 15, xxv.

The limitation of the Sabbath to the children of Israel, and the making it a sign of the covenant betwixt God and them, expressly negatives the construction put on the expression in Genesis, that by it the Sabbath was instituted. It is making God act most absurdly, to make him first institute the Sabbath for the whole world, and then give it as a sign limited to the Israelites, when, from its being previously established, it could most clearly be no such thing.

From several of these passages we see that the Sabbath was ordained as a sign of the covenant made betwixt God and the Israelites. As we have seen in Exodus that it was given as a sign of the covenant, so it was understood by Ezekiel, who says, verse 10, “Wherefore I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness;” 11, “And I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which, if a man do, he shall even live in them.” 12, “Moreover also, I gave them my Sabbaths, *to be a sign between me and them.*” Ezek. xx. 10-12. On this Dr. Paley says:—“Here the Sabbath is plainly spoken of as *given*; and what else can that mean, but as *first instituted in the wilderness?*”

But the observance of the seventh day of the week, as a Sabbath, is only a *small part of the Sabbatical Law*. In the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus a *Sabbatical year* is ordained: how absurd to take one part of the law relating to Sabbaths and not the other! If a Sabbath be kept because it is ordained by God, consistently, one Sabbath must be kept as well as the other.

The Sabbath, we have seen, was given as a sign of a covenant betwixt God and the Jews, which *covenant* was *expressly abolished* by the coming of Jesus Christ; then it necessarily follows, that the *sign* of the covenant should no longer be observed.

If a Sabbath be kept, because it was ordained by God previously to the time of Jesus, it must be kept *as he ordained it*; and how he ordained it, we can only know from the books and the practice of the Jews.

They were to do no work on that day, not even to light a fire; no victuals could be dressed, or even put on or taken off the table on that day: the candle was lighted before the day began; and if it went out, it could not be lighted again; and if a draught of water was wanted, it could not be fetched."*

* It is curious to observe how some persons can make difficulties in dispensing with the words of the law, when thereby they gratify their passions, their prejudices, or their interest; and how easily in other cases they can dispense with them, or rather say, set them at defiance. They say, the law of the Sabbath cannot be abolished, because it was given by God before the Israelites existed, and therefore is binding on all mankind, and not on the Israelites only. If this argument be good in one case, it is good in every other similar case. In the fourth verse of the ninth chapter of Genesis, it is said, "But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat." This was said to Noah. This is confirmed in the seventeenth chapter of Leviticus, where it is said, "And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood, I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people." In the following verses, to the end of the fifteenth, this order is several times repeated, *including strangers*; and in Deuteronomy, xii. 16, it is again repeated. "Only ye shall not eat the blood; ye shall pour it out upon the earth as water." And in Acts, where all the other laws of Moses are expressly abolished, this is excepted by name. And yet Christians of every denomination eat blood and animals strangled every day.

[*From the Eastern Galaxy.*]

SUNDAY MATTERS.

Johnson's Report on Sunday Mails has been printed in pamphlet form, and on satin for framing. "I fear more that the cause of true religion will suffer from the thrusts of the skeptic," says one. So do we not. True religion receives its finest polish from the shafts of the enemy—its pillars (which some vainly imagine will fall with what they term the Sabbath) are to remain unshaken amidst the convulsions of earth and heaven, for they are rested upon the foundations of the Almighty. Did we, however, wish the cause of religion an injury—did we wish to change the comparatively pure spirit of its most exemplary professors to corruption—did we, in short, wish to make mankind hypocrites and devils, and cause the very name of religion to become hateful,—we would, had we the power, wield the strong arm of civil law in its defense; we would compel the people to the performance of certain religious rites and ceremonies; we would compel them religiously to observe days and appointed seasons; we would assume the prerogative of Jehovah, and say to them, To-day ye may travel and do your business, but to-morrow is the Lord's day; in it ye shall neither work nor travel, under the penalty of death.

N. B. It will be said that no advocate for the Sabbath would wish to have the penalty of death enforced upon Sabbath breakers. Grant that they do not now wish it; but let the people generally countenance the steps already taken in some of the States, in exacting fines and imprisoning the violators of what men call the Sabbath, and in ten years, instead of money and liberty, *life* will be the forfeiture of the person who dares to travel on the first day of the week. Do you ask for the reason of this judgment? We answer, the best of all reasons, viz. They who believe that the fourth commandment to the Jews is binding on the Gentiles, and that this command should be en-

forced by civil law, will, as soon as they find the milder course of discipline ineffectual, and their wrath is sufficiently aroused by the want of success, feel under the necessity of adding the penalty of death, according to the Law of Moses. With good reason too they may ask, Why should we not do this thing? Since the *law* establishing a Sabbath is not done away, by what authority do we omit the *penalty* connected with it?

[*From the New York Courier.*]

SUNDAY UNION MEETING.

The attempt to stop the Mails on Sunday has been very happily disposed of during the present session of Congress. But if the free people of this country suppose that the individuals who originated that measure will quit all subsequent movements to accomplish their wishes, they will be, in the end, most sadly mistaken. The complexion of several of the resolutions passed at the meeting in question, a few days ago, bear distinct evidence that the project of stopping the Mails on Sunday, and thence commencing a system of political operations, that can and will end in nothing but a union of Church and State, is, instead of being abandoned from defeat, taken hold of with fresh energy, and renovated fervency. The great mass of the people of this country are the friends and advocates of piety and true religion—but they never will, and never can, consent that those men who are set apart for the services of heaven, whose characters receive consideration and weight from their keeping aloof from the world, shall organize themselves into a political club, shall institute branches, shall collect moneys, and appropriate those moneys for the purpose of influencing the legislation of Congress, and commencing a system of measures that can only lead to the most disastrous results. The character of religion is too sacred to be diverted to such purposes. The spiritual tyranny which convulsed the world for

two thousand years, always commenced its journey of ambition with singular simplicity of pretension.

[*From the Christian Intelligencer.*]

OPEN AVOWAL.

At the late Religious Anniversaries in New York, it has been openly avowed that it is the design of the orthodox in the United States to unite Church and State in this Republic. Hitherto they have strictly denied (or rather their papers have) that they entertained such a design; but finding that their denials will not avail them any thing, and that the public have penetrated into their purposes, they now throw off the disguise, and in a public anniversary meeting, confess that they are engaged in endeavouring to establish an *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* in this country. We rejoice that they have done so—they have but fulfilled what we have been satisfied they would have to acknowledge at last.

In a late number of the New York Daily Sentinel, appears a communication over the signature of "Phillipi," containing a statement of what the writer heard professed in the Middle Dutch Church in New York, the house where the Bible, Tract, and other National Societies held their Anniversary meetings a week or two since. We have not room for the whole article, and can copy only the gist of his communication.

[*From the N. Y. Daily Sentinel.*]

The author of the following communication has furnished us with his name. He is willing at any time to attest to the truth of what he states.—*Eds. Sentinel.*

Messrs. Editors.—Mere religious bigotry, even in this enlightened age, would be dangerous, were it not wisely ordered that the very excess of its malignancy, should be the means of prematurely exposing its virulent and impoisoning character. Could a railing fanatic, by any possibility, copy the meek and lowly demeanor of that

being whose precepts he assumes to have imbibed, his deep hypocrisy might be more surely fatal, because its operations would be conducted in dissembling silence. But he cannot keep his peace.

I have been drawn into this train of reflection by having heard this morning, in the Middle Dutch Church of this city (let every friend of civil and religious liberty—every supporter of the sacred rights of conscience, note the time and place) a speaker make use of language which I never expected to hear from the lips of an American. The different Bible, Tract, and other religious Societies held their general meeting in that Church. As might be expected, some eloquent addresses were delivered: but the particular passage to which I allude, was spoken by a very fine, charitable *looking* gentleman. I shall never forget the man, or his appearance; for to my thinking, his *words* are the most fraught with portents of evil, and the most memorable, that, as a lover of civil and religious liberty, it has ever been my misfortune to hear boldly, openly, and confidently expressed.

Turning to the President of the meeting, with much earnestness and solemnity, he asked, “*why they should not meet the charge* [that of attempting the UNION of Church and State in this country] *openly, and at once avow their real sentiments and intentions?*” He then continued in these precise words: “*We ARE endeavouring to UNITE Church and State in this Republic.*” He laid the emphasis upon the word “*are,*” which was the correct reading; for it leaves not even the shadow of a doubt as to the true meaning of the very patriotic and charitable speaker. He then declared that he was a Puritan! Is it not fortunate for the peace of society at large, that the mind of the bigot is filled with the spirit of restiveness, so that he is compelled to speak, and mankind may discover by hearing his sentiments, how to provide against and defeat his nefarious and anti-pa-

triotic schemes? Is not a man that would avow that he is endeavoring to effect an union of Church and State, not only guilty of the basest departure from his duty and allegiance as a citizen, but of absolute treason against the liberties of all mankind? For that the world at large is deeply interested in the preservation of the existing institutions of this Republic sacred and inviolate, is most clearly evident; and he who would subvert them, should be held to answer at the bar of the Universe.

But fortunately, these memorialists in favor of stopping the Mails on what *they* call the Sabbath, have, at last, been hurried by that besom-spirit which vivifies fanaticism, into an explicit avowal of their intentions to effect an union of Church and State in this Republic. *They stoutly denied it at first,* but now denial or retraction will not avail them.—Let it be distributed upon the untiring wings of the Press over the immense territory of our free, favored, and envied country—let every citizen who loves the glory and happiness of that country, instruct his children how best to prevent its downfall, by opposing the machinations of designing sectarians,—of uncharitable bigots—and thus preventing an union of Church and State.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

[The following extract is copied from the Life of Benjamin Franklin, and may not be without its use to some modern preachers. For although preaching in this day may somewhat differ from the preaching in Franklin’s time, much of it is equally as dry and uninteresting to any one who looks for substance, and for something calculated to make mankind better, as the preaching here so strikingly described.]

“Though I seldom attended public worship, I had still an opinion of its propriety, and of its utility when properly conducted, and I regularly paid my annual subscription for the support of the only Presbyterian minister or meeting we had in Philadelphia. He used to visit me sometimes as a friend,

and admonish me to attend his administrations; and I was now and then prevailed on to do so, once for five Sundays successively. Had he been in my opinion a good preacher, perhaps I might have continued, notwithstanding the occasion I had for the Sunday's leisure in my course of study; but his discourses were chiefly either polemic arguments, or explications of the peculiar doctrines of 'our sect,' and were all, to me, very dry, uninteresting, and unedifying; since not a single moral principle was inculcated or enforced; their aim seeming to be, rather to make us *Presbyterians*, than *good citizens*.

At length he took for his text that verse of the 4th chapter of Phil. "*Finally brethren, whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, or are of good report, if there be any virtue, or any praise, think on these things.*" And I imagined in a sermon on such a text, we could not miss of having some morality. But he confined himself to five points only, as meant by the apostle—viz: 1. Keeping holy the Sabbath day. 2. Being diligent in reading the holy scriptures. 3. Attending duly the public worship. 4. Partaking of the Sacrament. 5. Paying a due respect to God's ministers.

These might be all good things, but as they were not *the kind* of good things that I expected from that text, I despaired of ever meeting with them from any other—was disgusted, and attended his meeting no more."

—
For the Reformer.

METHODIST REFORMERS.

Since the separate organization of the Methodist Church in this country, many attempts have been made from time to time to introduce an improvement in her polity—these have failed of accomplishing their direct object—they have however tended to excite in the minds of many, a consideration of the charter under which they were born into the kingdom of Christ, which charter guarantees their right to freedom—"If the Son shall make

you free, ye shall be free indeed."—Perhaps the Methodists are of all people in christendom the least habituated to calm and abstract reflection—of course it will be understood I mean not to include all without exception. They are kept in a continued whirl of attendance upon outward forms of religious worship, and they discover great solicitude to keep the mind in a constant state of excitation, which indeed, seems to form with them a criterion by which to estimate a growth in grace. Hence their preachers are accounted profitable or otherwise, as their preaching tends or not to tumultuate the animal affections. To this trait in their general character, is possibly traceable the failure of the proposed reform in their church government, for certainly the arguments with which it was urged were irrefutable; but to a people incapable or indisposed to reflect, what does argument avail.

But it may be asked—Why did not the thinking part, the clergy in particular, place the subject in an impartial light before their less enlightened brethren? Ah! that indeed is a question easily asked, but a man may get himself into trouble by conscientiously answering it—yet, gentle reader, if you will lend me your attention I will whisper you a potent reason—the proposed amendment tended to diminish clerical power and privileges—let that suffice; I can give you no better, in fact no other reason. The conscientious part have either withdrawn or been expelled, and thus a considerable party is forming on the principles of Methodism Reformed. It is not my intention to dwell on the points at issue between the two orders of Methodists, nor to eulogise the one and asperse the other; I am not a party to the views of either—the Reformers, in my opinion, are destined to become a people, but not materially to affect the extension or permanency of the old order.

Perhaps it is my misfortune that I cannot perceive the utility of civil rule

and ordinances in the church of Christ, which church is an entirely spiritual institution, and ought not to exist in the form and nature of a civil compact. Christ alone is properly the head of his church—in him alone are vested the legislative, administrative, and executive authority. There is no act by which man more manifestly displays the imbecility of his nature, than that of assuming the prerogative of the Almighty, in dictating the terms of admission to the church of Christ. He thereby practises in the broadest sense on a literal construction of the passage, “I give unto thee the keys of the kingdom,” &c. “Who art thou,” demands an apostle, “that judgeth another man’s servant; to his own master he standeth or falleth”—man is amenable to the civil authorities, to his conscience, and to the Judge of all the Earth—but these it appears are not sufficient in the judgment of some: every petty modification of usurped authority must have a distinct tribunal for its gratification, and the inborn propensity in man to rule over his brother man, vents itself in the erection of a swarm of pigmy hierarchies under various names and pretences, which all operate against the exercise and enjoyments of the rights that man is manifestly entitled to by virtue of his moral relation to God. In what light are we to regard the numerous combinations of religionists into which the Christian world is divided, and by which it is kept in constant ferment? In what light, I ask, other than that of so many unnecessary and unauthorized establishments originating in the ignorance and ambition of man? Is this fact a matter of doubt; is it at all questionable while history stands, and every day’s observation confirms its truth? No, it cannot be; yet these all, and each, arrogate to themselves the title of the Church of Christ, and “all without are dogs,” &c. Well, be it so; I for one, am fully satisfied that the bond of union among Christians should of right be a moral, not a political one; an interchange of

love and unrestricted fellowship, spontaneously flowing from a similarity of views and feelings, trials, temptations and hopes. “All ye,” says Christ, “are brethren,” in regard to religion. The beggar and the king stand on a perfect parity—the servant of Christ is enjoined to call no man master on the earth, for one is his master even Christ. Possessing the spirit of his Lord, he will be governed by it, and led (when his mind is cleared of the rubbish of human dogmas) into all truth necessary for his present guidance. He will need no human ordinances to mark out his spiritual course, for the law of his master shall be a light to his feet and a lamp to his path. G. R.

[From the Mechanics’ Free Press.]
MOTIVE.

“Means have no merit, if our end amiss.”
Young’s Night Thoughts.

Messrs. Editors,—Every stream can be traced to the fountain from which it flows—every effect to the cause which has produced it; and all human actions to the motives from whence they spring. As the stream depends on the purity of the fountain for its refreshing and invigorating qualities, and as “good fruit” depends on a “good tree” for its flavor and luxuriance, so also does human actions depend for their character on the motives which govern the actors.

These truths are self-evident; and consequently require no argument to establish them. Every man possesses in his own bosom the evidence of their truth, whatever may be his theory on the subject. In judging, however, of the motives of our fellow men, it requires us to observe the greatest caution, and to make every charitable allowance for the honest prejudices of those who think and act differently from ourselves; and in no case should we impugn the motives of others, while they leave with us the liberty of honestly differing from them.

But even charity itself has its bounds; while it ~~relieves~~ ~~an enemy in distress,~~

it places not a weapon in his hand with which he may wound or slay his benefactor. While it fosters and protects the sincere, it discountenances and rejects the hypocritical. When, therefore, we behold one class of men, or portion of a community, who enjoy equal rights with others, endeavoring to obtain a controlling influence over the consciences of any portion of their fellow citizens, however small, charity calls on us to protect the weak against the inroads of the powerful—to shield the poor from the oppression of the wealthy, and to guard merit against the advances of influence.

Composed as is this great republic of numerous religious sects, each enjoying, under the auspices of our benign government, "free toleration in the exercise of their religious sentiments," it cannot fail to give pain to every reflecting and benevolent mind, to observe that one sect possessing, according to its own statements, such great advantages over the rest, should manifest a disposition to obtain an ascendancy over weaker sects, who honestly differ from it on a disputed point in theology.

That charity which protects the weak, the poor, and the deserving, prompts us to trace the petitions to Congress for stopping Sunday Mails up to the source from whence they have emanated—to endeavor to ascertain what peculiar interests the parties themselves have in the measures they so zealously pursue—how far these measures affect less wealthy and less influential sects—and, as the proper province of civil government is over civil affairs, to find out, if possible, what probable good (in a civil point of view) would result from governmental interference on a subject involving the dearest of all rights, *the rights of conscience*. It is not the object of the writer to travel with the reader through all the windings of this subject, but to place him at its entrance, with such directions as that he need not miss his way.

J. W.

[*From the Lockport Gazette.*]

It will be seen that R. M. Johnson, the intrepid defender of constitutional religious toleration, has again put his veto upon the project of stopping the Mails on Sunday. This loathsome offspring of bigotry is once more branded in the forehead, by the decided disapprobation of the committee of which Mr. J. is chairman. One would suppose that such frequent rebuffs might dampen the ardour of the noisy zealots who are striving to force this odious measure upon us. But, like the fabled hydra, no sooner is one head smitten off than two others sprout out in its place, each more hideous than the original. Nothing short of the actual cauterity seems capable of checking this portentous growth. For behold, following hard upon the heels of the committee's report, comes a *counter* report of the *minority* of that committee. Surely these men must be in the last extremity ere they would resort to such an absurdity in legislation to effect their purpose.

[*From the N.Y. Working Man's Advocate.*]

WHAT IS INFIDELITY?

The editor of the Pittsburgh "American Manufacturer" is engaged in a controversy wth the mayor of that city, who belongs to the church and state party, and is president of the "Association, Auxiliary to the Sabbath Union of New York, for promoting the observance of the Sabbath." The mayor, in one of his letters, accuses the editor of *infidelity*, to which accusation he replies as follows:

"What, sir, do you deem *infidelity*? Is it to dare to speak the truth, regardless of consequences, and to unmask hypocrisy; whose innate deformity, when held up to public view, defeats its own diabolical intentions? Is it, sir, to expose presuming ignorance, when it assumes the garb of profound wisdom? Is it to develop the designs of those, who, under the specious pretext of honouring God, would curtail the rights of his creatures? Is it, in fine, sir, to scourge with manly severity the designing hypocrite, who would, like the

midnight assassin, stab the liberties of our beloved country, while he concealed the dagger beneath the mantle of puritanical sanctity? If this is *infidelity*, I am an *infidel* indeed. And I glory in this, my *infidelity*. For such traits of character I would fearlessly develop, should they be found even in the mayor of this city. But, sir, to wantonly assail the principles of religion, or to cast reproach upon its *unfeigned* votaries, I have ever held in utter abhorrence."

Such, nine times out of ten, are the sentiments of those whom the church and state party (which is undoubtedly assuming a formidable attitude in our country) choose to term *infidels*. To such infidels, however, will the people ultimately be indebted for preventing the much and justly dreaded union of church and state, if, luckily, the abettors of that scheme should be thwarted in their endeavors.

[*From Priestcraft Exposed.*]

This number completes the second volume of *Priestcraft Exposed*. For various reasons we conclude to suspend the publication for a time—at least sufficient for those in arrears to remit the balance our due. We cannot now say when the work will be resumed—of this we will hereafter inform our subscribers.

We have much reason to rejoice at the defeat of the scheme to suppress the Mail. That an extensive influence is exerted over the whole continent of North America, through the medium of various societies and auxiliaries—an influence which is the very life-blood of Priestcraft, cannot be denied. Were it not for these numerous combinations—each exerting its influence, and throwing its *gleanings* into one vast receptacle—the people would have little to fear from the Clergy. But so long as these associations continue, just so long will the liberties of our country be in danger. Of all combinations, those in the *dress* of religion, the people are the least prepared to oppose. Thousands, even when convinced that the liberties of country are in danger, fear to act, supposing that *religion* itself would be

injured. Another very numerous class do not believe the Clergy really wish to amass wealth, and thereby obtain power; when not a move do they make, but has this object directly in view.

Mr. Frelinghuysen's Resolution.

We learn from the papers that Mr. Frelinghuysen brought up his resolution in the Senate against the transportation of the Mail on Sunday, and made a speech in support of it. To this speech, Mr. Livingston replied, and the resolution, we are told, "was laid on the table by a crushing majority."

Since the above was written, we have seen Mr. Frelinghuysen's speech in the Senate. It is quite lengthy, and among other things, he observes:

"I firmly believe that the suspension of the Mail [on Sunday] would exert the happiest influence. It would call up public attention. It would present the claims of the Sabbath with such force of interest and weight of influence, as would, I hope, establish and perpetuate it. The Mail arrested, and the Post Office closed on Sunday, by the solemn authority of Congress.—Who can fail to see the noble impulse that would be given. Sir, [addressing the President of the Senate] this would correct all false and degrading estimates of this sacred day—it would almost of itself form a public sentiment. The floods of vice and infidelity would be stayed in their course. Such high example would silence the cavils of the profane [who speak against the designs of priestcraft.] And this, as I understand it, is the true old fashioned way to popularity."*

* It seems Mr. Frelinghuysen is in a fair way to obtain some popularity. At the late Anniversary Meeting of the society denominated the "*General Union for Promoting the Observance of the Sabbath*," held in New York, a letter was read from Mr. Frelinghuysen, in which he regretted his inability to be present at the meeting—and he has been chosen President of the Society, and Mr. McCrea, who made the Report in the House of Representatives in

In another place, in speaking of the effect which would be produced if Congress would stop the Mails on Sunday, he says: "All the state regulations [respecting Sunday, and every other measure favoring the wishes of the priesthood] would be quickened into *active enforcement* by your example. You [Congress] have paralyzed their influence, and many of them are become [very justly] lifeless enactments. But should Congress speak out firmly, [by stopping the Mail on Sunday] it would awake vigilance in all the state governments, and we might hope very soon to behold our whole country in the enjoyment of a tranquil Sabbath." Rather, we should say, we might behold our whole country under the dominion of priestcraft, and in the enjoyment of such laws as once existed in the Eastern states, commonly termed *Blue Laws*.

We have not yet seen Mr. Livingston's reply. Are the papers afraid to publish it?

[From the *Sentinel and Star in the West.*]

Extract of a letter from a respectable member of the bar in the city of New Orleans.

New Orleans, April 4, 1830.

To THE EDITORS,—A godly Tract pedlar arrived here some time since, and zealously began to act under his commission, by thrusting his person into every assembly and private dwelling, distributing his works, and, as usual, begging withal to enable him to proceed in his pious labours. Finding that by wheedling, and the means usually put in operation on such occa-

favor of stopping the Mail on Sunday, has been elected Vice President of the same society.

Mr. Frelinghuysen is certainly correct in supposing it to be "the true old fashioned way to popularity," to favor the schemes and wishes of the priesthood; and this way has been used in thousands of cases by artful and unprincipled men to get into power, and to secure them in oppression and tyranny over the rights and liberties of the people.

sions, he should not be able to answer the expectations of his employers, or perhaps his own, he had recourse to robbery! But in this last part of his commission he did not appear to be an adept, for he has been detected. He was brought before the Mayor, and the last I heard of him, he awaited his trial, among other things, for having stolen a watch of considerable value. Perhaps you may have heard of this before, for it was noticed in the city papers. In the Argus a particular description was given, and if that paper is taken in Cincinnati, I presume you will be able to learn the sentence he receives from the Court.

[From the *New Orleans Argus.*]

There are some things of almost every day occurrence in life, that are scarcely even "tickled with whips of velvet," that ought, nevertheless, to be scourged with rods of iron. At the present moment, there is nothing that requires the scorpion lash so much as the efforts that are now making in our city to distribute the Bible and Tracts, by men who, almost in the same moment that they engage in the benevolent work, as it is called, of distributing "the bread of life," commend themselves to the vigilance of the police officers. Two or three instances of this kind have recently come to our own knowledge; but we, for the present, forbear names and circumstances. It is to be regretted, that in their great zeal or haste to distribute the Bible, the managers should have committed the task to men, who, in executing it, frequently trample upon the common decencies and civilities of life, and bring reproach upon the religion which we all venerate. So it has happened, however; and many of their unmanly and dishonest tricks, because they are performed under the garb of more sacred concerns, are suffered to pass without investigation. Let them, however, beware how they demean themselves: forbearance in respect to them has ceased to be a virtue; and

neither the benevolent object in which they are engaged, nor the names of the men who sanction it, can much longer screen them from being exposed to the public.

Before dismissing this subject, we will not refrain from remarking that the great number of societies into which the community of our country is divided, is becoming every day a more serious nuisance. Factitious means are resorted to by many to maintain a position in society to which their merits do not entitle them—they assume a sanctified air, join Sunday Schools, Tracts Societies, and other charitable institutions, merely for the benefit of their own temporal affairs, and not for the love of the souls of others. The members of these various societies support each other; and while advantage is to be derived from them, their numbers will increase.—The consequence is, that we have become a clannish people, and an honest and meritorious man may scarcely succeed in the world, unless he bows his neck under the yoke of some one or other of them.

Extract of a letter from a correspondent in Tennessee.

“ Clerical domination has, unfortunately, made gigantic strides in this part of our happy Union—so many appear to think that unless they place themselves under the fostering wing of some Priest, and let him, as it were, take charge of their sins, that they can travel no road but the broad one that leads to ruin. They go in crowds, both in the country and in cities, and stop at nothing to get themselves comfortably seated every Sabbath under the sound of their preacher’s voice, who undertakes to show them the way to heaven for a price in gold or silver. Men full of ambition and the love of this world, set themselves up for teachers and leaders, and the people, on account of their ignorance and credulity, do not pretend to judge for themselves, but suffer those usurpers and intruders

to judge for them in all cases. They bring to my recollection the following circumstance: A gang of sheep in the neighbourhood where I live, were in the habit of committing depredations on the neighbouring farmers by jumping into their fields and destroying their crops, led by a large wether, who distinguished himself by carrying the bell. It so happened that a well was dug near to a fence that surrounded a green and inviting field of wheat, which well was in the field. The leader of the gang could not withstand the temptation presented to him, and in crossing the fence (unfortunately for the owner of the flock) leaped into the well, which was about forty feet deep. The flock, confiding in the judgment of their leader, did not look for themselves, but followed him, and they all soon found themselves at the bottom of the well.

“ So it is with religionists in this day. Their leaders are endeavouring to unite Church and State, and accomplish things dangerous to liberty and fatal to our happiness. A great part of the community follow them without inquiring into the probable consequences.”

THE SURE WORD OF PROPHECY.

The most appalling and discouraging passage in the whole Bible, in the way of prophecy, is contained in *Rev. xv. 8.*—When the “seven golden vials, full of the wrath of God,” are given to the seven angels, we are told that the *temple* (designed to contain pure and acceptable worshippers) *is filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power* (in the exercise of his judgment on a sinful world) *so that no man is able to enter into the temple, till the seven plagues of the seven angels are fulfilled.*

The first of the plagues here alluded to, commenced when the Revolution in France began, and continued during the bloody and destructive wars which followed that event, and which, in the Revelation, are described under the symbol of *reaping the harvest of the earth.* But the more sanguinary and destructive wars signified by the *gathering of the vintage, and treading it in the wine-press of the wrath of God,* are

all yet to come; and they will be infinitely more awful and bloody than those of the harvest, inasmuch as it is declared that during the calamities of this period, *blood will come out of the wine-press, even unto the horse-bridles, by the space of a thousand and six hundred furlongs.*

Till these events take place, or are nearly completed, it seems, from the prophecy, that none will be able to *enter into the temple*, or get into a pure and righteous condition, and hence, under the judgments of the four first vials, which constitute the harvest, men are represented as *blaspheming the name of God, who has power over these plagues, and not repenting to give him glory.* Again, under the fifth vial, men are said to *blaspheme the God of heaven, because of their pains and their sores, and not to repent of their deeds.* And again, under the seventh and last vial, which fills up the wrath of God, and the calamities of which will not cease till all are destroyed or subdued to righteousness, men, we are told, will *blaspheme God on account of the plagues and miseries they suffer; for it is declared they will be "exceeding great."* Greater indeed they will be than any which precede them,—and as before observed, they will continue till the whole inhabitants of christendom are brought to righteousness or destroyed. Under this vial, therefore, it is not said, as under the others, *they do not repent.*

It should be observed that these latter calamities are principally to come on Christian nations, so called, which are termed *the vine of the earth* (instead of a true or right vine) and its clusters are to be reaped and *cast into the wine-press of the wrath of God*, to be trodden and pressed by unparalleled woes and calamities. And as a space of time intervenes between the *harvest* and the *vintage*, so it will be in the case of the seven last plagues, else such symbols as the *harvest* and *vintage* would not have been used. We now live in that space of time, and if any one can ascertain how many days there are from the time of harvest to the gathering of the vintage,—fix the time when the wars of the French Revolution ceased,—and will then allow a day for a year, he will know as exactly as a calculation of the time from the harvest to the vintage can be known, when the calamities of the three last vials which belong to the vintage, will begin.

The wars which followed the Revolution in France, and which had their origin in that event, continued, we believe, as many as twenty years, answering to twenty days in prophetic language, which is a

period sufficiently long to finish the harvest in the natural world, and the vintage may not embrace a much shorter period when it shall arrive.

A friend in North Carolina, has sent us a number of the North Carolina Spectator, containing a review of Mr. Leland's letter to Col. Johnson, (copied from another paper) and also a communication in favor of stopping the Mails on Sunday, signed "*A Clergyman.*" As the first of these productions contains little else but satire and low wit, and the latter is destitute of any solid argument, we do not deem them worthy of much notice. Priests who have leisure may spin out long cob-web reasonings on almost any subject, wholly unworthy of any attention, and only calculated to confound and bewilder themselves and all who listen to their sophistry. Such a person as Mr. Leland, and such lucid arguments as are presented in Col. Johnson's Report, are assailed in vain by corrupt and ambitious priests, who are only vexed that they cannot shine as bright in the eyes of the nation as they otherwise might, did no such champions and friends of liberty as Mr. Leland and Col. Johnson, expose their wily and insidious designs. If the "*Clergyman*" in North Carolina has sufficient leisure (as we presume he has) let him devote a portion of his attention to the arguments respecting Sunday, copied into some of the late numbers of the Reformer, and which we purpose to continue in a few numbers hence.

Extract of a Letter from Chester County, Pennsylvania.

"**ESTEEMED FRIEND,**—I have been a reader of the *Reformer* steadily from its first issuing, but had no expectation for some years, that I should view it with the degree of interest, or attach to it the importance that I now do. My mind has indeed accompanied thee closely for some of the last years in the objects brought into view by the *Reformer*, but especially that one of watching the encroachments of the "*Sunday Mail*" men, upon our liberties, and with timely and untiring zeal, holding up to view the incessant warning. The last year has brought forward events, which, however distressing, greatly enhance the value of the whole work to me; as it enables me to acquaint myself with the standing of different religious bodies, to scrutinize their proceedings, detect the fallacy of their pretensions, and form a just decision respecting all their movements."

A writer in the *New York Telescope* of April 24, under the signature of JUNIUS, has offered the following reward:

FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS

to any person who shall point out a single passage in the New Testament, certifying that the Sabbath was changed from the *seventh* to the *first* day of the week.

FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS

to any person who shall point out in the New Testament, a single precept or a single example, for calling the *first* day of the week the Christian Sabbath.

FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS

to any person who shall point out in the New Testament, a single precept or a single example, for keeping holy the *first* day of the week.

N. B. Editors generally, are requested to publish the above advertisement in their respective papers.

[*From Priestcraft Unmasked.*]

The Little Falls (N. Y.) People's Friend mentions a society who advertized for a priest who cared more for the *flock* than the *fleece*. The Middletown Sentinel remarks very truly, that it would be a difficult matter to find such a one.

[*From the Christian Baptist.*]

The intolerant zeal with which some of the most aspiring sectaries urge governmental interference in behalf of the cessation of Sunday Mails, has convinced me that political designs are at the bottom of the prayers of many of the petitioners.—The leaders evince a spirit of resentment against those who do not coincide with their schemes—who do not sustain their pretensions, which illy comports with that zeal for holiness which they profess in favour of the Sabbath.

At a meeting of the Farmers' and Mechanics' Association, held at Lyme, Connecticut, March 25, among other resolutions unanimously adopted by the meeting, was the following:

"Resolved, That in our opinion, the Legislature have no authority to grant the monies and privileges which belong equally to the great body of the people, to Colleges and Churches, or any other partial establishments."

AMERICAN STENOGRAPHIC ACADEMY—By M. T. C. GOULD, No. 6 North Eighth street, Philadelphia. Mr. Gould teaches persons to record the language of public speakers as fast as delivered. Those

who cannot attend his personal instructions, may acquire the art from his book—the 7th edition of which is now before the public, price 50 cents.

N. B. This work will be sent by mail to any part of the United States, on the following conditions:

If \$1 be enclosed in a letter from a less distance than 150 miles, the writer will receive a copy of Short Hand free from postage both ways. If from a greater distance than 150, he will receive two copies, paying his own postage both ways. Post Masters, and others, who prefer to pay their own postage both ways, will, of course, receive two copies in all cases.

☞ A copy shall be sent to the publisher of any newspaper in the United States, who will give this advertisement one insertion, and forward a number of his paper containing the same.

The first number of "*The Christian*" is issued, and will be forwarded to subscribers with the Reformer for the present month. We need a much more numerous subscription to defray the expenses of the work, and hope those who approve of the publication, will endeavour to promote its circulation in their neighbourhoods.

☞ When it is not convenient for persons to call on the Editor, at his residence No. 290 North Third Street, in order to subscribe for the *Reformer* or *Christian*, or to make payment, they may call at the Printing Office, No. 20 Church Alley, where names will be entered, and credit given, by John Richards, the printer, for whatever sum is paid. The Editor's residence being in the northern part of the city, merchants and others coming to this city, from the South and West, often find it inconvenient to go so far from the central part of the city, and it is more particularly for their accommodation that the above arrangement has been made. Church Alley is but a few rods north of Market Street, between Second and Third, and is as near the centre of business as almost any part of the city.

The Reformer is printed on the first of each month, at one dollar a year. Letters to be addressed and payment made, to T. R. GATES, Proprietor and principal Editor, No. 290 North Third Street, Philadelphia. Numbers can be supplied from the commencement of the work.

J. RICHARDS, PRINTER, 20 CHURCH ALLEY.